



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,782	06/07/2001	Christina Banta	US010388	8851
24737	7590	05/16/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			COBANOGLU, DILEK B	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			3626	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/16/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

09/876,782

**Applicant(s)**

BANTA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dilek B. Cobanoglu

**Art Unit**

3626

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See continuation sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11: Applicant argues that Seliger does not teach "a computer-implemented study merging method or computer program product in a computer readable medium involving merging a patient's first medical study with a logically related or similar second medical study, to create a composite study", Examiner respectfully submits that Seliger teaches "a method and apparatus for coordinating updates to a record by entering a first and second record and keeping a correction history, which contains information as to the update of the record with the first new data value and information as to the update of the record with the second new data value" in col..3, lines 6-23, updating a record (that means the data values are logically related or similar) and keeping the correction history for the data is basically merging the data values. Seliger continues in col. 3, lines 52-56 that the correction history provides a permanent record of all changes to the patient flowsheet, and can be displayed in response to a request.

Applicant argues that Seliger fails to show reconciling study identifiers of the first and second medical studies, Examiner respectfully submits that Seliger teaches "each database event includes a sequence number and event information, database events represent new information or data" in col. 11, lines 56-65, Examiner considers sequence number is a study identifier. Selinger continues in col. 12, lines 20-30 that "by adhering to the sequence numbers of database events the final parameter value represents the current value". Examiner considers adhering sequence number creates a unique number for the database events, and first and second sequence numbers are different than each other.



C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

09/876,782  
Response

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Christina Banta Docket Number: US010388  
Serial Number: 09/876,782 Examiner: Dilek B. Cobanoglu  
Filing Date: June 7, 2001 Art Unit: 3636  
Title: Method and computer readable medium for merging studies

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

O.K. TO  
ENTER  
DBC.

Response

This paper is in response to an Office action mailed March 12, 2007 from the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

As this response is filed on or before June 12, 2007, Applicant believes that no extension fee is due.

Amendments to the specification are found on page 2.

Amendments to the claims are found beginning on page 3.

Remarks begin on page 8.